

### Remarks

Claim 1 is canceled. Claims 2, 9, 14, 18 and 23 are amended herein. Claims 2-24 remain pending in the Application. No new matter has been added.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

#### Claims 2-24

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Shimura (6370687). Applicants have reviewed the Office Action and believes the Examiner meant to reject Claims 2-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Shimura and has responded accordingly. Applicants have reviewed Shimura and respectfully states that Shimura does not teach nor render obvious the present invention for the following rationale.

Regarding currently amended Independent Claims 2, 9, 14, 18 and 23, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 2 (Claims 9, 14, 18 and 23 include similar features) includes the features “a server code segment manager coupled to the application code transformation manager, for parsing the client application in the native binary format into a plurality of code segments, said parsing of said code segments is being dynamically performed based on actual server-side and client-side execution overhead, network bandwidth efficiency and client-side storage requirements on a per client basis, and configured based on predicted code segment usage or prior code segment usage history (emphasis added).” Support for the Claimed features can be found in the Figures and Specification including Paragraph [0055].

Applicants respectfully submit that Shimura does not teach this claimed feature. Applicants do not understand Shimura to teach dynamic parsing of application code into code segments wherein the parsing of the code segments is dynamically performed based on actual server-side and client-side execution

overhead, network bandwidth efficiency and client-side storage requirements on a per client basis (emphasis added).

Applicants do not understand Shimura to teach parsing of code into code segments dynamically based on actual server-side and client-side execution overhead, network bandwidth efficiency and client-side storage requirements on a per client basis (emphasis added). For this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Shimura does not teach or render obvious the claimed features and as such Claims 2, 9, 14, 18 and 23 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and as such, Claims 2, 9, 14, 18 and 23 are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submits that Shimura does not teach or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 3-8, 10-13, 15-17, 19-22 and 24 which are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 2, 9, 14, 18 and 23 and that Claims 3-8, 10-13, 15-17, 19-22 and 24 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully states that Claims 3-8, 10-13, 15-17, 19-22 and 24 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully requests allowance of Claims 2-24.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 11/27/06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John P. Wagner, Jr.", is written over a horizontal line.

John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060